

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-58 and 65-66 remain pending in this application. Claim 58 has been amended. Claims 65 and 66 have been added. Claims 59, 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64 have been cancelled.

Claim 58 has been amended by incorporating subject matter of claims 59 and 60. New claim 65 has been added based upon claims 58, 59 and 61. Claims 59, 60 and 61 have accordingly been cancelled. Claim 66 has been added based upon claim 58 and as supported in the present specification, including at page 15, lines 18-22. No new matter has been added.

With respect to the informalities found in the claims at page 2 of the Office Action, the interpretation of language in claim 58 is generally correct, except that upon consideration of the term of $1-300 \mu\text{m} \pm 1\%$, the applicants believe the $\pm 1\%$ to be confusing and so " $\pm 1\%$ " has been deleted from claim 58, as shown above.

The objection to claim 59 has been rendered moot because of claim 59 being cancelled.

While claim 61 has been cancelled, the applicants appreciate the Examiner's notation of error in claim 61. Pr_w has been corrected as suggested to be PrO_w in new claim 65, which incorporates subject matter from claim 61.

The applicants submit that the noted informalities and objections have been overcome.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 58, 62 and 63 under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Chun et al.

The applicants further traverse the rejection of claims 58, 59, 62, 63 and 64 under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Sekine et al.

Neither of the cited references make the presently claimed invention to be obvious.

The applicants note, however, that claims 60 and 61 are allowable (page 4 of Office Action). Claim 58 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 60 and intervening claim 59. The applicants submit that amended claim 58 is thus allowable. Subject matter of claim 58, claim 59 and allowable claim 61 have been combined to form new claim 65. The applicants submit that new claim 65 is thus allowable.

With regard to claim 66, the applicants point out that the degree of sphericity of the presently claimed particles ("precise spherical shape of less than or equal to $\pm 10\%$ ") is uniquely high and is thus not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Further, the prior art does not disclose or suggest the recited features of a crystalline composition comprising a nanocomposite structure of metals including an aggregate of nano-sized metal components separated within the particles by

layers or discrete nano-sized bodies having composition selected from the group consisting of metal oxides, metal nitrides and metal silicides.

The applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is fully allowable in view of the prior art.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER, PLLC
CUSTOMER NO. 20736

By Paul E. White, Jr.
Paul E. White, Jr.
Reg. No. 32,011
Tel. No.: (202) 261-1050
Fax No.: (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W.
Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307
(202) 261-1000